

III.B.1a

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Roberta Lewandowski, Planning and Community Development Director, 425-556-2447
Judd Black, Development Review Manager, 425-556-2426
Gary Lee, Senior Planner, 425-556-2418

DATE: September 6, 2005

**SUBJECT: STAFF REPORT: PLANNING COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATION
ON THE UNIT LOT SUBDIVISION/ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN
FLEXIBILITY DEVELOPMENT GUIDE AMENDMENT, L040139**

City Council action on this topic is scheduled for September 20. In preparation for your action, staff is scheduled to brief the City Council on the proposed Development Guide Amendments at the September 6 meeting.

Background

These amendments were privately initiated by Robert Pantley of Ameritech Investments, Inc, with an application to amend the Development Guide dated May 4, 2004. The purpose of his amendment request is to enable townhouse units to be sold on fee-simple lots, as is currently allowed through the PRD provisions in residential zones. Mr. Pantley's Development Guide Amendment request was made in conjunction with a Site Plan Entitlement application to develop 22 townhouse units with street-front ground floor home offices and corner commercial spaces, on the southeast corner of NE 83rd Street and 160th Avenue NE. His intent was to subdivide the townhouse units so they could be sold as fee-simple properties, as opposed to condominium units, and instead of rental units.

Planning staff visited several developments in Seattle where subdivision and fee-simple ownership of attached housing is allowed, and determined that the amendment would be worth pursuing. It would provide an alternate and desirable ownership options, and could potentially encourage more housing in Redmond's downtown.

Therefore, the concept of the Unit Lot Subdivision was devised in order to create fee-simple townhouse units, as opposed to "condominium units." The "Unit Lot Subdivision" is the name of the approach being used in Seattle today, and has resulted in many new and attractive duplex and triplex townhouse developments in different Seattle neighborhoods.

Proposed Amendments for Consideration

To allow subdivision of townhomes in the downtown, two sections of the Redmond Community Development Guide are proposed to be amended.

(1) Add a new category to the Exception to Lot Standards (RCDG Section 20D.180.10-060), adding paragraph (6) Unit Lot Subdivisions.

The new subsection, creating Unit Lot Subdivisions as another exception to the Subdivision Lot Standards, is intended to allow attached townhouse products to be subdivided into fee-simple properties that may be sold and owned like single-family homes, as opposed to condominium units. The Unit Lot Subdivision provision would be effective citywide, allowing such subdivisions only where attached townhouse units are already allowed by the zoning.

(2) Amend the Administrative Design Flexibility provision for Downtown (RCDG Section 20C.40.40-030).

The amendment to the Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF) provision of the Downtown regulations is intended to make the provision usable to all downtown properties, regardless of size, and to provide a little more flexibility to the standards. This ADF amendment, in combination with the recommended Unit Lot Subdivision amendment, will in essence provide the Downtown neighborhood with an equivalent Planned Residential Development (PRD) process for subdivisions, which currently does not exist.

The Planning Commission held one study session and a public hearing on the matter. Two people spoke in favor of the amendments; nobody spoke in opposition to them. The Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend adoption of the amendments.

Schedule and Requested Direction

At your September 6 meeting, staff would like feedback on any initial questions or information that would be helpful in your review of the proposed amendments. In the meantime, if you have any questions as you review the amendments and accompanying report, please contact Gary Lee at 425-556-2418.

As there are only minor changes needed to the ADF provisions to accomplish the same results, the PRD/PCD provisions were not recommended to be extended to the Downtown neighborhood. Attached dwellings, townhouses, apartment buildings, and condominium buildings are already allowed Downtown. The proposal will also keep the process simpler for Downtown developments. If the PRD/PCD were extended to the Downtown, the process would require a Hearing Examiner recommendation and City Council approval (Type IV) process. While the proposed method only requires Technical Committee approval (Type II) for 9 or fewer lots, and Hearing Examiner approval (Type III) for 10 or more lots, the Design Review Board must see all applications involving attached dwellings.

Attachment A: Draft Amendments and Planning Commission Report

ATTACHMENT A

Planning Commission Report

To: City Council

From: Planning Commission

Staff Contacts: Roberta Lewandowski, Director of Planning and Community Development (425) 556-2447
Judd Black, Development Review Manager (425) 556-2426
Gary Lee, Senior Planner (425) 556-2418

Date: September 15, 2005

DGA Number: L040139

Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval

Recommended Action: Adopt Ordinance No. _____, adopting amendments to the Subdivision regulations to add Unit Lot Subdivisions as an Exception to Lot Standards, and adopting amendments to the Downtown Administrative Design Flexibility regulations.

Summary: The subject amendments are intended to facilitate the development of more for-sale housing products in the Downtown neighborhood and other areas of the City that allow multi-family and other attached housing. The Unit Lot Subdivision regulations will allow townhouse units to be sold as fee-simple, single-family, homes as opposed to condominium units, and would create a mechanism to legally recognize that the buildings (typically zero-lot-line townhouses) are not required to meet zoning standards, such as setbacks, based upon the new 'unit lots'... as the design of the development is reviewed and approved based upon the pre-subdivided 'parent lot'.

The amendments to the Downtown Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF) regulations will also help facilitate the development of such housing Downtown, as the ADF provisions will be able to be used on smaller parcels than before, and minor deviations from parking standards can be considered. The existing site size threshold (40,000 square foot minimum site area) to qualify to use of the ADF provision has precluded the City from being able to consider some desirable housing concepts that have been proposed recently. Eliminating the site size threshold will allow the ADF provision to be used by any development site Downtown when the proposed design is found to be superior with the proposed deviations in development standards.

Background: With current condominium liability issues, whereby numerous insurance companies have gone out of business or have stopped issuing condominium liability insurance, and whereby the availability of condominium liability insurance has decreased, and the cost of such insurance has increased dramatically, real estate developers have generally stopped building condominium projects. Staff has noticed a decline in inquiries about developing condominium-type townhouse projects over the past few years. However, it recently came to our attention that the City of Seattle allows such subdivisions for townhouse type-developments, that most of these new townhouse developments are attractive, and that there is a considerable sales demand for these types of units.

A developer who is interested in building townhouses in Downtown Redmond urged Planning staff to look at these products in Seattle, to see if Redmond might allow this type of development Downtown. After seeing these properties in Seattle, and after looking at conceptual site plans, Planning Staff informed the developer that the City would like to be able to approve such development, but our regulations currently do not allow it, especially with regard to the subdivision. Planning Staff informed the developer that if the Administrative Design Flexibility provisions were amended to allow parking to be a design standard that can be modified, these types of products could be approved as condominiums and apartments, and would not need a subdivision.

This proposal is a privately initiated Development Guide Amendment submitted by Robert Pantley of Ameritech Investment Inc. The purpose of this application is to establish a process to allow the subdivision of townhouse developments so each unit is on its own parcel, but apply development standards, such as setbacks, to the original property boundary as if it were not subdivided, instead of applying the development standards to the new lots, as in regular subdivisions. Specifically, this application seeks to allow the subdivision of land for a townhouse project on the southeast corner of NE 83rd Street and 160th Avenue NE. This project is known as Redmond Court, which has an approved Site Plan Entitlement application to develop the site with 22 townhouse units. The concept of Redmond Court is that it could be townhouses on fee-simple lots, thereby avoiding the liability issues associated with condominiums.

In essence, the request is to create a process whereby a multi-family townhouse development that is allowed to be built by the zoning code can be subdivided for the purposes of creating fee-simple lots under the attached dwellings, as opposed to creating a condominium. This application was originally going to be batched with the Downtown Development Guide Update, which will soon follow. However, because of the complexity of the Downtown Development Guide Update itself, it was determined that this subject should be processed separately in order to facilitate a faster adoption of these subject amendments, if the Planning Commission and City Council agree with the concept and staff's recommendations. The Planning Commission agreed with staff to process this separately from the pending

Downtown Development Guide update.

Other methods of flexibility, including Planned Residential Development (PRD) applications and Planned Commercial Development (PCD) applications, are not listed as being available to be used in the Downtown neighborhood to create subdivisions that vary from general standards. This is because the development standards for Downtown are among the least restrictive in the City, with virtually no minimum requirements for subdivisions, and setback standards that allow zero property line development. Moreover, as multi-family development is one of the primary land uses allowed Downtown, townhouses in the form of condominiums and apartments are allowed and encouraged, but not on separate lots. Because there is no PRD or PCD provision for Downtown to allow deviations in subdivision standards, the Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF) regulations for Downtown is proposed to be amended to allow the necessary flexibility PRDs provide for subdivisions in Residential zones and PCDs provide for subdivisions in Commercial and Business Park zones.

**Reasons the
Proposal should
be Adopted:**

The proposed amendments creating Unit Lot Subdivisions as an Exception to Lot Standards, and amendments to the Downtown Administrative Design Flexibility regulations should be adopted because they:

- Will facilitate the development of more for-sale housing Downtown and in other areas of the City that allow multi-family and attached housing.
- Will facilitate the development of housing types that are highly desirable, but not readily available Downtown and in other areas of the City.
- Will facilitate the development of for-sale housing products that are less expensive than typical single-family detached homes in Redmond because the product types will be attached townhouses.
- Will allow the Downtown Administrative Design Flexibility provision to be used on all lots, as opposed to those that are 40,000 square feet and larger, providing the City the ability to consider approving development proposals that are superior in design and meeting the intent of the neighborhood, even when the proposal does not meet all of the development standards.

Public Participation

1. Public Hearing and Notice

a. Public Hearing Date

The City of Redmond Planning Commission held one public hearing regarding the proposed Development Guide amendments on July 20, 2005. One person attended this hearing. The public was given additional opportunities to comment on the proposed ordinance at the Planning Commission Study Session held on July 13, 2005. Public comments supported the proposed amendments.

b. Notice

Notice of the public hearing was published in the Eastside edition of the Seattle Times on July 6, 2005. Public notices were posted in City Hall and at the Redmond Library, and also on the City's website and cable television. Notice was also given by including the hearing date in Planning Commission agendas and extended agendas mailed to various members of the public and various agencies. Notice was also provided to those who had previously indicated an interest in the subject.

2. Public Comments

The Planning Commission heard comments on the proposed Ordinance from the Applicant (who initiated the Development Guide Amendment) and from another interested person at the previous study session.

A total of two people spoke during the duration of the Planning Commission's review of this amendment package. Both of the people who spoke were in favor of the proposed amendments. The Applicant (Robert Pantley) testified that he was in agreement with Planning Staff's recommended amendments and the comments made thus far by the Planning Commission. He stated that the Staff recommended amendment package is a collaboration of his initial application and Staff's work, and that he felt the Staff recommended amendment has turned out much better. Mr. Pantley expressed that he supported the need for the flexibility the amendments provide in the design guidelines, so developers can be innovative and creative when new concepts make sense, and he stated that he has had very good experiences with the Design Review Board and the Technical Committee, and thinks there are a lot of safeguards in the Redmond development review processes. The other person speaking (Scott Bergevin) at the July 13, 2005 study session, stated that he was also in support of the amendment package, as it will provide more flexibility for developers who want to develop in the Downtown, especially in this area of Perrigo's Plat, as he believes the recently adopted comprehensive plan policies for this area have made it more difficult to develop.

Planning Commission Consideration

1. *Key Issues Raised by the Planning Commission*

Attachment B includes a summary of the Planning Commission's major discussion issues and responses. Below are the key issues raised by the Planning Commission.

a. **What should be the appropriate scope of these amendments? Should they be City-wide or should they be applied to the East Hill district of Downtown as a starting point?**

A summary of the Planning Commission's discussion on this item can be found in the Issues Matrix in Exhibit B under No. 2.

The primary reason the Planning Commission considered applying the amendments to the East Hill district of Downtown as a starting point, as opposed to City-wide, is because Staff expressed a concern that the townhouse type products that would be encouraged by the proposed amendment would likely be developed at a lower density than what is targeted for some districts of the Downtown neighborhood. Too many of those types of developments might conflict with the goals for Downtown housing production. To address this concern, Staff recommended that a minimum density of 35 dwelling units per acre be required for such developments in the Sammamish Trail and Town Square districts of Downtown.

The Planning Commission considered the effects of applying the amendments only to the East Hill district of Downtown, and concluded that doing so would preclude the Applicant's proposed townhouse project, in the Town Square district of Downtown, from being able to take advantage of the amendments. The Planning Commission agreed with Staff's recommended minimum density requirement for the Sammamish Trail and Town Square districts of Downtown as it would allow the Applicant's project to qualify to use the amendments, and concluded that the amendments should be applied City-wide, with the minimum density requirements for the aforementioned districts.

Also, regarding this issue, Staff suggested considering a three-year sunset clause, so the City could evaluate the effects of the amendment at the end of three years to see whether or not too many low-density townhouse developments are being developed in the Downtown neighborhood. The Planning Commission agreed with the suggestion and added the three-year sunset clause to the amendments.

b. **Effective date of the ordinance.**

A summary of the Planning Commission's discussion on this item can be found in the Issues Matrix in Attachment B under No. 5.

The Planning Commission expressed concern about making the amendments effective prior to the adoption of new design standards for the Perrigo's Plat sub-area of the East

Hill district of Downtown. The recently adopted Comprehensive Plan policies for the newly created Perrigos's Plat sub-area of Downtown call for design standards that guide new buildings to be scaled and styled to complement the existing character of the sub-area. As the design standards have not been created and adopted yet (tentative review to begin with the Planning Commission September 2005), the Planning Commission was concerned that there could be a rush of development applications in the sub-area that do not meet the intent of the recently adopted Comprehensive Plan policies for the sub-area (in order to vest the projects under existing regulations and prior to the adoption of new design guidelines). With that, the Planning Commission added a later effective date for the amendments, for the Perrigo's Plat sub-area. That effective date would be the same as the effective date of the pending design standards for the sub-area.

2. *Planning Commission Recommendation*

The motion to recommend adoption of amendments to the Subdivision regulations to add Unit Lot Subdivisions as an Exception to Lot Standards, and amendments to the Downtown Administrative Design Flexibility regulations was approved by a vote of 6 to 0 on July 20, 2005. The Planning Commission's Report was reviewed by the Planning Commissioners in August 2005.

List of Attachments

- Exhibit A:** Planning Commission's Recommended Amendments to the Redmond Community Development Guide to Add Unit Lot Subdivisions as an Exception to Lot Standards in the Subdivision Regulations and to Modify the Downtown Administrative Design Flexibility Regulations
- Exhibit B:** Planning Commission's Issues Matrix
- Exhibit C:** Planning Commission Hearing Minutes (to be approved at the Commission's next meeting date on September 21, 2005)
- Exhibit D:** Technical Committee Report

Roberta Lewandowski, Planning Director

Date

Martin Snodgrass, Planning Commission Chairperson

Date

Approved for Council Agenda: _____
Rosemarie Ives, Mayor

Date

UNIT LOT SUBDIVISION PROVISION

Add below to 20D.180.10-060 – Exceptions to Lot Standards

(6) Unit Lot Subdivisions. The provisions of this section apply exclusively to the unit subdivision of land for townhouses that have land use approval through either Site Plan Entitlement, RCDG 20F.40.130; Planned Residential Development, RCDG 20C.30.105; or Planned Commercial Development, RCDG 20C.60.60. The purpose of this provision is to allow for the creation of unit lots under each separate residential unit while applying site development standards to the building(s) on the parent lot, as a whole, instead of to the individual unit lots created subsequent to Site Plan Entitlement approval.

- (a) Sites developed or proposed to be developed with townhouses may be subdivided into individual unit lots. The development as a whole shall conform to plans granted approval through either Site Plan Entitlement, RCDG 20F.40.130; Planned Residential Development, RCDG 20C.30.105; Planned Commercial Development, RCDG 20C.60.60, or Innovative Housing Demonstration Project. As a result of the subdivision, development on individual unit lots may be nonconforming as to some or all of the site development standards based on analysis of the individual unit lots. Each unit lot shall comply with respective building codes. Fire protection for the buildings shall be based on the aggregate square footage on the parent lot.
- (b) Internal courts providing vehicular access to unit lots in the subdivision from the public street shall not be considered public or private streets when considering subdivisions under these provisions.
- (c) Subsequent platting actions, additions or modifications to the structure(s) may not create or increase any nonconformity of the parent lot.
- (d) Access easements, joint use and maintenance agreements, and CC&Rs identifying the rights and responsibilities of property owners and/or the homeowners association shall be executed for use and maintenance of common garage, parking, and vehicle access areas; underground utilities; common open space (such as common courtyard open space); exterior building facades and roofs; and other similar features, as recorded with the Director of the King County Department of Records and Elections.
- (e) Within the parent lot, required parking for a dwelling unit may be provided on a different unit lot than the lot with the dwelling unit, as long as the right to use the parking is formalized by an easement on the plat or short plat, as recorded with the Director of the King County Department of Records and Elections.
- (f) Notes shall be placed on the face of the plat or short plat as recorded with the Director of the King County Department of Records and Elections to acknowledge the following:

- (i) Approval of the design of the units on each of the lots was granted by the review of the development, as a whole, on the parent lot by Site Plan Entitlement, Planned Residential Development, Planned Commercial Development, or Innovative Housing Demonstration Project (stating the subject file application number).
- (ii) Development, redevelopment, or rehabilitation of structures on each unit lot is subject to review and approval of plans that are consistent with the design of the surrounding structures on the parent lot as approved by the City through (subject file number as stated in (i) above).

Add New Definitions as follows

NEW DEFINITIONS – SECTION 20A.20.120

Lot, Parent.

The initial lot from which unit lots are subdivided for the exclusive use of townhouses.

Lot, Unit.

One (1) of the individual lots created from the subdivision of a parent lot for the exclusive use of townhouses.

Revise Section 20C.40.40-030 as follows

20C.40.40-030 Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF).

The purpose of this section is to promote creativity in site layout and design, and to allow flexibility in the application of standards for commercial, office, retail, mixed use and residential development within the ~~City Center~~Downtown Neighborhood, and to achieve the creation of sites and uses that may benefit the public by the application of special design policies and standards not otherwise possible under conventional development regulations and standards: ~~General development permit procedures defined in RCDG Title 20F, Administration and Procedures, shall apply in the establishment of an ADF in City Center~~Departure from standards included in this section may be permitted as part of the Site Plan Entitlement process.

~~(1) Qualifying Standards. In order to qualify for the Administrative Design Adjustment within the City Center Neighborhood, a property must meet the following criteria:~~

~~(a) The property must contain not less than 40,000 square feet; and~~

~~(b) The property must be bound by two or more public streets; and~~

~~(c) The proposed project design must demonstrate all of the following:~~

~~(i) Superiority in achieving~~

~~(1) Deviations from these standards may be allowed if an applicant demonstrates that the deviations from the standards would result in a development that:~~

~~(i) Better meets the intent of the~~ goals and policies for the design area in which the site is located;

~~(ii) Is Superiority superior~~ in design in terms of architecture, building materials, site design, landscaping and open space; and

~~(iii) The project provides Provides~~ benefit to the ~~City Center Downtown~~ Neighborhood in terms of desired use, activity, and design.

(2) ADF – Flexibility of Design Standards in ~~City Center Downtown~~. Requirements of RCDG Title 20C, Land Use Regulations, that may be modified by application of this subsection are defined specifically as follows:

(a) Parking Lot Location. Requirements for the location of on-site parking lots may be modified within the development (except for parking within residential yard areas) to provide for greater joint-use and quasi-public parking opportunities and uses which are highly desirable in the subject design area.

(b) Mid-Block Pedestrian Walkways and Vehicular Lanes. Requirements for mid-block pedestrian and vehicular lanes per RCDG 20C.40.105, ~~City Center Downtown~~ Pedestrian System, may be modified to allow variations in locations and minimum widths for these items to provide superiority in site design and function which benefits both the property owner and public.

(c) Street standards for townhouse subdivision developments.

(ed) Other Site Requirements and Standards. All other site requirements and standards for ~~City Center Downtown~~ except density, ~~parking~~, height and FAR may be modified within the development to provide superiority in site design: i.e., greater amounts of privacy, maintenance of views, preservation of vegetation, provision of usable open space, adequate light, air, and security. (Ord. 1901)

Exhibit B

Summary of the Planning Commission's Substantive Discussion Issues DGA L040139; Unit Lot Subdivision/ADF amendment

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>1. What are the expected implications of the proposed amendment for the City's 2022 housing target and housing capacity, particularly for the Downtown and for Overlake? (Petitpas, Querry)</p> <p><i>Commissioners requested estimate of City's 2022 housing target and capacity info for the Downtown.</i></p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>The Planning Commission read Staff's Recommendation and Reasoning below and concluded there was no issue. Commissioners commented that though they had some concern about retaining opportunities for higher density residences in the Overlake Center, they also believed that for the near-term, seeing housing development in the Overlake Center, even if at lower densities, is desirable.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u></p> <p>Staff believes that the proposed amendments will not negatively affect the probability of the City achieving the 2022 housing target. Redmond's 2022 citywide housing target is 9,500 new dwelling units; 2,700 of these new dwellings are estimated to occur in the Downtown neighborhood and 1,900 in the Overlake neighborhood. This target was derived by identifying parcels that have a high likelihood of being developed/redeveloped within the 2022 time frame, and estimating the number of units that could be created. For the Downtown, the density estimates were conservative and ranged from 30 to 50 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). For most of the Downtown, a density estimate of 45 du/ac was used, which provides a good average that allows for development of considerable amounts of land at 30 du/ac, as other areas of the Downtown neighborhood should, and most likely will be developed at densities in excess of 70 du/ac. Current projects in the pipeline, and preliminary discussions with prospective developers about various sites in the Downtown neighborhood indicate that developers are interested in developing residential products at densities higher than 70 du/ac. Staff does not recommend any changes regarding this issue.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p> <p>None.</p>	Closed

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>2. What is the appropriate scope of the proposed amendment? Should it apply Citywide as proposed? (Petitpas)</p> <p>Should it apply in East Hill as a starting point? (Allen)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Planning Commission read Staff's Recommendation and Reasoning below, and further discussed the alternatives. In addition to Staff's recommendation to add a minimum density requirement for the Sammamish Trail and Town Square districts of Downtown, Commissioner Allen expressed that there should also be a sunset clause on the Unit Lot Subdivision regulations to evaluate its impact before allowing them to continue. The Planning Commission supported the idea of a sunset clause. The Planning Commission discussed whether 3 or 5 years was appropriate. It was determined that 3 years was an appropriate time to evaluate the regulations' impacts, and that the sunset provision should be added to the regulations, along with the minimum density requirement for the Sammamish Trail and Town Square districts of Downtown. The Commission also agreed to revisit the question of whether to establish minimum residential densities in the Overlake study area as part of upcoming implementation and refinement of the Overlake Neighborhood Plan.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Staff believes this question relates to the proposed amendments' possibility of having unintended affects such as: reducing the probability of reaching Downtown housing targets; and inadvertently allowing housing development types that are not consistent with the vision of certain sub-neighborhoods (not being as tall or dense as originally envisioned).</p> <p>To address these issues the following alternatives could be chosen:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue as recommended in Technical Committee Report. 2. Establish a 3 year sunset clause, whereby the Unit Lot Subdivision provision will be automatically eliminated, unless specifically extended by the Planning Commission and City Council. A new paragraph could be added to the Unit Lot Subdivision regulations to affect this change. 	<p>Closed.</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>3. Establish a minimum density in certain zones where higher density and taller buildings are more desired than 2-story townhouse type products. Such areas might include the Sammamish Trail and Town Square Districts in Downtown, and potentially, portions of the Overlake Center. A new paragraph could be added to the Unit Lot Subdivision regulations to affect this change.</p> <p>4. Establish design criteria in certain zones to ensure that the lower density type housing developments do not inadvertently affect the desired character of sub-neighborhoods calling for taller buildings. Such areas might include the Sammamish Trail and Town Square Districts in Downtown, and potentially, portions of the Overlake Center. Design standards could be established in future update of the Downtown Development regulations and Design Standards.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Although it's possible a developer may want to develop duplex type townhouses Downtown (outside of the East Hill district), it is less probable that a developer would, as Mr. Robert Pantley stated to the Planning Commission on July 13, 2005, as developers generally want to maximize their development potential as much as possible. With that said, Staff is not too concerned with a possible unintended affect of creating an opportunity where too much proposed development will be of a lesser density and scale than envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan. However, to ensure that suburban scaled housing products (such as duplex type townhouses) are not developed in areas where more 'urban-village', multi-story, housing products are desired (as in the Sammamish Trail and Town Square sub-districts of Downtown)--- to more importantly ensure that a land-use type/architectural style of building that is not consistent or compatible with the vision is not inadvertently constructed, a minimum density of 35 dwelling units per acre should be established for Unit Lot Subdivisions in these sub-areas. Therefore the following</p>	

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>standard is recommended to be added to the proposed Section 20D.180.10-060 (6):</p> <p>(e) The minimum residential density required for Unit Lot Subdivisions in the Sammamish Trail and Town Square districts of Downtown shall be 35 dwelling units per acre. There shall be no minimum residential density requirement for Unit Lot Subdivisions elsewhere in the City unless required by the zone in which the site is located.</p> <p>The reasoning behind establishing the minimum density at 35 du/ac is because that is the density of the Applicant's proposed product (Redmond Court). The design of Redmond Court provides a scale and architectural character consistent with 'urban village', multi-story, housing. If a minimum density higher than 35 du/ac is required by these amendments, it would preclude the approval of the applicants proposed subdivision for his townhouse development.</p> <p>For the Overlake Center, staff does not recommend establishing a minimum density at this time. First, the type of detailed planning needed to determine desired character for potential Overlake Center sub-districts has not been undertaken yet. Second, staff is not too concerned about potential negative implications of the proposed Unit Lot subdivision amendment in the short-term since the pace of housing development in the Overlake Center during the past several years has been much slower than expected.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> None.</p>	

<p>3. Should there be a minimum site size required for Administrative Design Flexibility? (Snodgrass)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> Commissioner Snodgrass expressed concern that the Unit Lot Subdivision process could be used with the Site Plan Entitlement process to deviate from residential development standards, without having Design Review Board evaluation of the proposed design.</p> <p>Staff clarified how the Unit Lot Subdivision process would be an additional application that would overlay an <u>approved</u> site plan to create “unit lots” under the approved townhouse units, and that any flexibility in creating a site plan that does not meet general design standards must be approved <u>first</u> through the PRD, PCD, or ADF for Downtown. After reviewing the Community Development Guide regarding the Site Plan Entitlement process, it was concluded that the Design Review Board must review all developments involving two or more attached dwelling units.</p> <p>Staff suggested some minor edits to the Unit Lot Subdivision provisions to help clarify the intent. The Planning Commission agreed with the suggested revisions.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Staff recommends that there be no minimum site size required for Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF). As the granting of Administrative Design Flexibility is a subjective approval process, based upon the entire development BETTER MEETING the intent of the goals and policies for the Downtown Neighborhood the site is located in, WITH THE PROPOSED DEVIATION, this provision is not something that is given to the site by right. With this process, the Technical Committee and/or Design Review Board (depending on the scale of the project) must determine and agree that the overall design of the development (WITH THE DEVIATION) better meets the intent of the neighborhood, is superior in terms of architecture and materials, and provides benefit to the Downtown neighborhood in terms of desired land use activity, and design. Thus far the Technical Committee and Design</p>	<p>Closed</p>
---	---	----------------------

	<p>Review Board have been more than competent in their review and approval of such applications. Staff is confident that these bodies will continue to scrutinize such applications to ensure that the standards for granting Administrative Design Flexibility approval are met.</p> <p>With regard to the original 40,000 square foot site size requirement being used as an incentive for aggregating parcels, this provision has not been as successful as the Downtown Residential Density Chart, whereby greater residential density is given to larger parcels. To our knowledge, nobody as aggregated parcels just so they could qualify for the ADF provision.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> None.</p>	
<p>4. Should permeable surfaces be required as part of the proposed amendment? (Parnell)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Planning Commission read Staff's Recommendation and Reasoning below, and concluded there is no issue.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Staff recommends that this discussion take place outside of this proposed amendment topic. Groundwater recharge should be dealt with as a general standard of development, not as part of a Unit Lot Subdivision and/or Administrative Design Flexibility application. Staff can have the Stormwater Division of Public Works explore the idea of developing regulations for requiring projects to provide on-site ground water recharge, if that is desired. A cursory discussion with engineers indicates that a water quality structure will be required for parking area run-off. Addition discussion is required regarding rainwater from rooftops.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> None.</p>	Closed.
<p>5. Should the effective date of</p>	<u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>	Closed.

<p>adoption for the proposal be postponed to the effective date of new regulations and design standards for Perrigo's Plat sub-district? (Allen)</p>	<p>The Planning Commission read Staff's Recommendation and Reasoning below, and concluded that establishing a postponed effective date for the Perrigo's Plat sub-area of the East Hill district should be done, and that the effective date should coincide with the effective date of the pending design standards for the Perrigo's Plat sub-area.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> With regard to this question (which is the concern that the new Unit Lot Subdivision provisions could encourage a rush of development applications that do not meet the newly adopted policies - and yet to be adopted design standards - for the Perrigo's Plat sub-district), Staff contacted the Applicant, Mr. Robert Pantley, to ask him if a delay in the effective date of the amendments, to a time near the end of the calendar year (possible time frame for adoption of upcoming Downtown Development Guide updates), would negatively impact his plans for the Redmond Court project. He suggested that instead of postponing the effective date City-wide, postpone the effective date for the Perrigo's Plat sub-district, if that is the only area of concern. Staff finds that to be a reasonable solution, and recommends that as an option, instead of delaying the effective date for City-wide adoption.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> None.</p>	
<p>6. Can Residential PRD's (Planned Residential Developments) in Residential Zones use the Unit Lot Subdivision provisions to circumvent street and lot standards prescribed by the Residential & PRD</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Planning Commission read Staff's Recommendation and Reasoning below, and Commissioner Snodgrass expressed his concern that the Unit Lot Subdivision regulations could be used, by themselves, to create site plans and subdivisions that do not meet general zoning standards, if someone simply made an application for Site Plan Entitlement. Staff clarified that the Unit Lot Subdivision regulations are not intended to be the vehicle that allows deviations from standards, and explained that deviations in zoning standards come from the zoning regulations the sites</p>	<p>Closed.</p>

standards? (Snodgrass)	<p>are in: through processes such as PRDs in Residential zones and the Administrative Design Flexibility provisions in the Downtown neighborhood. Staff also explained that there is no PRD or PCD process for Downtown developments, and that is why the Administrative Design Flexibility provision and Site Plan Entitlement is needed for such developments Downtown.</p> <p>Commissioner Snodgrass asked Staff if the Design Review Board reviewed all development applications. After reviewing the Development Guide, Staff clarified that the Design Review Board reviews all residential development applications through the Site Plan Entitlement process, except for single-family detached housing.</p> <p>Staff suggested that subparagraph (b), as shown below, be eliminated from paragraph (6), and also suggested that additional language be added to subparagraph (6)(a) to further clarify that developments must conform to the zoning regulations the site is in, in order to avoid misconstruing that someone could pick and choose their standards if they just make an application for a Site Plan Entitlement.</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u></p> <p>The intent of the proposed Unit Lot Subdivision provisions is to allow a subdivision map to <u>overlay</u> an approved development plan, in order to create fee-simple lots under the approved townhouse site plan. The Unit Lot Subdivision application is foreseen to be an application that is required <u>in addition to and subsequent to</u>, a Residential PRD in a residential zones, and PCDs in Commercial and Industrial zones respectively. The Residential PRD would be the application vehicle that would allow general deviations (that are allowed by the PRD provisions). The Unit Lot Subdivision application is not the vehicle that would allow deviations in development standards, except for the subsequent relation of the new Unit Lot property lines in relation to the footprint of the townhouse buildings on the Unit Lots.</p> <p>The ambiguity regarding this issue may arise from paragraph (6)(b) of the</p>	
------------------------	---	--

	<p>proposed Unit Lot Subdivision provisions, which states:</p> <p>(b) Internal courts providing vehicular access to unit lots in the subdivision from the public street shall not be considered public or private streets when considering subdivision under these provisions.</p> <p>Staff recommends that this sub-paragraph be eliminated from the proposed provisions, as the existing PRD and PCD provisions allow for deviations to street standards in the Residential, and Commercial/Business Park/Industrial zones, and the proposed amendments to the ADF provisions (new subparagraph (2)(c), shown in Exhibit A, page 3) adds street standards as a design criteria that can be varied from in the Downtown neighborhood.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> None.</p>	
--	---	--

Exhibit C

REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

July 20, 2005

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairperson Snodgrass, Commissioners Allen, McCarthy, Parnell, Petitpas, Querry

STAFF PRESENT: Lori Peckol, Gary Lee, Redmond Planning Department

RECORDING SECRETARY: Karen Nolz

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Snodgrass in the Public Safety Building Council Chambers. All Commissioners were present.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved by acclamation.

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE – None

PUBLIC HEARING

Unit Lot Subdivision Provisions and Update to Administrative Design Flexibility Regulations for Downtown, L040139

Chair Snodgrass opened the public hearing.

Mr. Lee presented a brief overview of the proposed amendment RCDG Section 20D.180.10-060, Exceptions to Lot Standards; and 20C.40.40-030 Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF). He explained that the amendment was initiated by Robert Pantley, and a copy of the application was Exhibit B in the packet. He continued that staff has analyzed the proposal and come up with a recommendation similar to what is presented in Exhibit B. The Unit Lot Subdivision Provisions would be effective citywide, but the Administrative Design Flexibility Regulations for Downtown would only effect downtown. He inquired if anyone had any comments on the matrix of discussion issues. There were none.

The applicant Robert Pantley explained that the proposed amendment is a collaboration between the applicant and staff. He thought staff took his ideas, and made them better. Since Redmond is becoming more urban, there is the opportunity to do a different kind of housing. Now, in Redmond, a townhome cannot be platted. This amendment would allow townhome residents to have a garden. He said that he has had very good experiences with the Design Review Board and the Technical Committee, and thinks there are a lot of safeguards in Redmond. For the City to allow more types of creative uses would be excellent. Mr. Pantley said that he had just returned from a sustainable development tour in Europe where the residents are able to create rooftop gardens that are a different kind of open space. He supported the need for flexibility in the design guidelines, so that developers can be innovative and creative when new concepts make sense.

Chair Snodgrass closed the public hearing.

STUDY SESSION

Referring to the issues list, Chair Snodgrass said that he had prepared a couple of proposed amendments pertaining to #6. He added these to the discussion.

Issue #1 – What are the expected implications of the proposed amendment for the City’s 2022 housing target and housing capacity, particularly for the Downtown and for Overlake?

Commissioner Querry wanted to discuss the dwelling units per acre, and noted that there is a second issue that makes a recommendation around minimum dwelling units per acre.

Chair Snodgrass said that being able to have a garden, a safe backyard for children to play, and privacy are important to the quality of life of residents, particularly in downtown.

Commissioner Petitpas said she does worry that they are not getting quite as much density as they would like. But she thought the amendment addressed her current issues, and is going in the right direction.

There was agreement with the staff recommendation, and Issue 1 was considered closed.

Issue #2 – What is the appropriate scope of the proposed amendment? Should it apply Citywide as proposed? Should it apply in East Hill as a starting point?

Commissioner Allen commented that her proposal regarding starting in East Hill would mean that Mr. Pantley could not build his wonderful Redmond Court, so she withdrew the proposal.

Commissioner Petitpas said that she wants to make sure this would not be addressing only that one project, but that it is citywide.

The language on page 3 marked as (e) that staff wants to add to reserve areas of downtown slated for greater density and to have a higher minimum density seemed a good idea to Commissioner Allen.

Mr. Lee explained that staff does not think the two downtown sub-districts, Sammamish Trail and Town Square should have a product like the duplex-type townhouse products shown in exhibits, so staff is proposing the minimum residential density required for Unit Lot Subdivisions in those two sub-districts of Downtown. Staff is fine with having that product in the East Hill district.

Ms. Peckol added that staff does not recommend establishing minimum residential density for Overlake Center at this time, and would be happy just to get more housing, in general. There is not a vision for certain sections of that overall center similar to what there is for downtown because that area has not been taken to that level of planning. The existing vision for Overlake is for the whole rather than sub-districts within it as downtown has. But minimum density is a good thing to think about eventually for Overlake Center.

Commissioner Parnell questioned the three-year sunset clause being an effective instrument. He wondered if the City has a lot of sunset clauses, and how often they occur. He questioned if they would be driving their future schedule by going with a sunset clause for the Unit Lot Subdivision amendments. Also, the last five years have seemed somewhat slow for development, so a three-year window seems small. The economy is just now picking up again. The proposed condos along the railroad tracks are starting to take reservations now. He questioned if three years is an effective time window, or would five years be an acceptable alternative to that. He thought he might be willing to support this depending on the answer.

If the market gets really hot, Mr. Lee said that three years might be an adequate window. There is not that much land left to develop in downtown.

Commissioner Parnell asked if this could not be revisited if there is a noticeable trend. He commented that he likes innovative housing.

Mr. Lee responded that whenever there are areas like that where someone has a concern about zoning there is the option of a moratorium. Redmond has not often had a moratorium.

Chair Snodgrass asked if there was support for discussing a sunset clause.

Commissioner Allen thought a sunset clause to be a good idea given the concerns about density. This type of housing might dilute the density goal, so it would be good to review the issue.

Commissioner Petitpas agreed that this is a focused-enough product that if reviewed again in three years would not take a lot of time. There would also be some history to watch to see what has happened. There is such a lack of available land. She would like to look at this issue in a few years.

Commissioner Query thought there to be no harm in doing that. She said she knows the makeup of Commission and Council will be different then, and thinks having different eyes look at this after it has been in place for awhile is a good idea.

Commissioner McCarthy agreed that this is a good idea, and three years is the right interval.

Chair Snodgrass reiterated the other suggestions—establishing minimum density or design criteria, and asked if there was agreement that is fairly well handled by subparagraph (e).

Mr. Lee thought subparagraph (e) would address Item 3, and added that Item 4 is a recommendation for that.

There was agreement with the staff recommendation.

When Commissioner Query requested to see the Sammamish Trail and Town Square districts on a map, Mr. Lee showed her a district map on the overhead.

Issue #3 – Should there be a minimum site size required for Administrative Design Flexibility?

Chair Snodgrass explained that the Downtown is where the City would like to see development of higher density developments and a transit center so there is less concern with minimum site size requirements and the proposed amendment. With regard to other locations in the City, such as residential neighborhoods, he expressed concern that a proposed development under the Unit Lot Subdivision provisions would only be reviewed by the Technical Committee, and that there would not be sufficient guidance and review related to design standards, siting compatibility with the neighborhood, and similar concerns.

Chair Snodgrass pointed out that Site Plan Entitlement requires design review except in the case of single-family dwellings, so one could receive approval for a single-family development without Design Review Board review. He thinks a review would be important in a situation like this, so he would propose that if an applicant is seeking exceptions on lot standards on any of these applications that they be referred to the Design Review Board for review, using the general criteria of compatibility with the neighborhood and overall City design standards. He agreed with Mr. Pantley that Redmond has an excellent Design Review Board, made up of individuals who are experienced in design and who have a vision for the City. He noted that the portion of the Development Guide that relates to the Design Review Board's authority

would have to be amended to add the authority to review this sort of application. His question is whether to do this as part of the Site Plan Entitlement process or wait until the permit process. He thought the logical thing would be to do it in the Site Plan Entitlement.

Mr. Lee responded that the first paragraph of Exhibit A provides that the Unit Lot Subdivision provisions apply only if the proposed development is granted approval through Site Plan Entitlement, Planned Residential Development, or Planned Commercial Development. He clarified that Site Plan Entitlement is for downtown applications. Planned Residential Development provisions do not apply in the Downtown. For the Downtown, the only way for an applicant to seek flexibility is through the Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF) provisions.

Referring to the second paragraph 6 (a), Commissioner Petitpas noted that Mr. Lee mentioned a fourth review method – Innovative Housing Demonstration Project. She suggested that this method also be included in the first paragraph in paragraph 6.

Continuing, Mr. Lee explained that the intent is that an applicant would seek any deviations from development standards by first completing the Planned Residential Development process (for residential neighborhoods) or the Administrative Design Flexibility in the Downtown Neighborhood through the Site Plan Entitlement process. Flexibility in design standards is not provided through the Unit Lot Subdivision process. To eliminate confusion, he thought that Paragraph b on Page 1 could be deleted from the Unit Lot Subdivision because that standard is included in the Downtown ADF as Item (c). He explained the hierarchy of how these amendments work. The Unit Lot Subdivision provision is like a subdivision map that is laid on top of a site plan that has already been approved. Then, with the Unit Lot Subdivision, all the property lines of the unit lot do not affect the setbacks. It is the property lines of the parent lot. The proposed ADF amendment to allow deviations in the street standard for the Downtown is needed because currently, the City has no process that applies to the Downtown through which to consider such deviations. In the residential zones, it is the PRD that allows variations in lot standards and lot configuration and street standards provided that the density is not increased. There is no section in the PRD process for the Downtown.

Chair Snodgrass clarified that his concern was that the Unit Lot Subdivision provisions could be used instead of the PRD process, and that the protections of Design Review Board and Technical Committee review would not apply. .

Saying that he understood the question, Mr. Lee had already asked some staff members about their understanding of the PRD versus the Unit Lot Subdivision, and they echoed his understanding that in the residential zones, to deviate from the normal subdivision standard, a PRD is required first. That is why it says the Unit Lot Subdivision is applied to plans that are already approved through a Planned Residential Development or Site Plan Entitlement process. Unit Lot Subdivision is something that would be applied to a site plan that has been approved already. He confirmed for Commissioner Allen that there is no minimum size for a residential PRD.

Commissioner Allen said that she is concerned about someone trying to go around the regulation to get design flexibility, and asked if it is possible to just apply for a Site Plan Entitlement. Mr. Lee responded that this is possible, but would be a waste of money because it is not like a variance and does not give any flexibility.

Mr. Lee clarified for Chair Snodgrass that townhome residences are attached, and would not be exempt from the Site Plan Entitlement. Mr. Lee confirmed that every project of this sort has to go through Site Plan Entitlement or the PRD process, whichever one applies. However, there is one possible refinement of the proposed amendment that might further address the concern. In Exhibit A, Paragraph A, Page 1, he proposed changing the second sentence to: "The development as a whole shall conform to the regulations

of the zone the site is in and to plans granted approval.” Chair Snodgrass had thought that Design Review Board review would be discretionary with the Technical Committee under Site Plan Entitlement. But Design Review Board review is mandatory under the PRD for attached dwelling units.

Chair Snodgrass emphasized that he wants for single-family residential the requirement for Design Review Board review.

Ms. Peckol read page 200 in the Design Review Board section that two-unit residential buildings would go to the Design Review Board review.

Mr. Lee said his understanding is that basically, all developments except a single-family detached dwelling have to go to the Design Review Board.

Chair Snodgrass withdrew his proposed amendments commenting that his concerns addressed. His initial concern was that people would use these provisions for scattered development of fourplex units. Staff agreed this is unlikely to occur.

There was agreement with the staff recommendation, and Issue #3 was closed.

Back to Issue #2

Commissioner Querry requested a straw poll on the rewording of 20D.180.10-060(6)(e), concerning establishing a minimum residential density in the Sammamish Trail and Town Square districts of downtown

Commissioner Parnell said he recently reviewed the Comprehensive Plan Housing Element. There are five different policies that speak to affordable housing. But also there is a policy that requires if density is reduced in one area by a rezone, then there must be compensation by allowing more density elsewhere. He agreed with adding (e).

Commissioner Allen commented that she does not see the proposal as a request for rezone. The developers can still build up to the maximum zone that was there previously. This might affect their incentive to do so.

Chair Snodgrass clarified that they are not changing the zoning or reducing the capacity.

Commissioner Parnell thought that the net effect of this change would be to promote affordable housing.

Commissioner Petitpas rationalized that these might not be tiny apartments, but they could certainly be more affordable than large houses. This is a really key option for housing in capacity as well as price. She thought it a good idea to put in at least a couple of areas where higher density should be maintained.

There was agreement with the proposed wording of (e) under Issue #2.

Issue #4 – Should permeable surfaces be required as part of the proposed amendment?

Commissioner Parnell said he would not be in support of permeable surfaces being required anywhere near a wellhead. He expressed support for the staff recommendation.

There was agreement with the staff recommendation, and Issue #4 was closed.

Issue #5 – Effective Date of Proposal for Perrigo Plat

Commissioner Allen explained that she had been looking at the Downtown policies specifically for the Perrigo Plat, and one of the policies, DT 68, required maintaining views from the street or open space between buildings by avoiding a continuous building face along the block. Her concern is that a development like Redmond Court could, under the current rules, be built as a condominium or apartment in Perrigo Plat, although this has not happened because of the insurance-for-condominiums issue. The policy changing these regulations has not been implemented yet. Her concern is that this proposal could result in a rush to the Permit Center to vest prior to the regulations that are pending in a few months. Possibly by opening this up by allowing Unit Lot Subdivision, developers might create something bigger and more massive in Perrigo Plat than what has been imagined. Her question to staff yesterday was about what would be the effect of delaying the effective date of the Unit Lot Subdivision ordinance to coordinate with the passage of regulations for downtown. She said she was satisfied with staff's response on this issue.

Mr. Pantley reiterated his suggestion to establish different dates in different areas and to delay the date for the Perrigo Plat area. This seems to him to be a reasonable approach.

There was agreement to delay the effective date of the Unit Lot Subdivision ordinance in Perrigo Plat to coordinate with the passage of regulations for downtown.

Addition #6 – Addition below to 20D.180.10-060 – Exceptions to Lot Standards

Chair Snodgrass proposed that “lain” be changed to “laid” on the Issues table in Issue 6.

On Exhibit A, Page 1 of 3, subparagraph (d), last sentence: Change “as recorded with the Director of the King County Department of Records and Elections” to “and shall be recorded with the Director of the King County Department of Records and Elections.” Provisions (e) and (f) are correct as is.

Commissioner McCarthy asked why this alternative did not fall under Innovative Housing. Mr. Lee responded that Innovative Housing was too far along for this to be included.

Commissioner Petitpas explained that this is already allowed to be built; it is just the lot-size minimum and the fee-simple issue that this addresses, and the Innovative Housing does not.

Regarding the parking standards, Mr. Pantley explained that for Redmond Court the Design Review Board and he wanted to put a landscape area in the middle of the motor courtyard; but coming out of the garage, drivers had to have a certain distance that could not be changed or modified. This was very frustrating

Chair Snodgrass and Commissioner Query both commented that parking should be deemphasized and some flexibility given to parking around residential developments.

It was moved by Commissioner Parnell and seconded by Commissioner Query to recommend adoption of these amendments with the agreed upon changes, as follows:

- **Include the staff proposal for a three-year sunset clause and the addition of subparagraph (e), regarding minimum residential density, although it may have to be relettered.**
- **The addition of language in (a) regarding compliance with the regulations of the zone.**
- **The Perrigo Plat effective date change**
- **Those minor editorial changes that were made.**

Commissioner Parnell wanted to emphasize that this is one of the best things the Planning Commission has approved in recent history. It allows for more market-based infill development. Diversity of housing is really stressed in Redmond as being necessary and important to our future. He said he does not think that considerations of lot coverage should preclude anybody from not voting to approve these particular amendments.

Commissioner Allen seconded what Commissioner Parnell said and congratulated Mr. Pantley for bringing forward such an innovative ordinance. The City has challenged the development community to bring in some products that are of smaller scale. There were so many developers who came to them and said they could only build six stories for this to pencil out. Yet here there is something that is human scale and also penciling out for developers.

Motion carried unanimously (6-0).

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

August 10 Approval of the Planning Commission Report on Unit Lot Subdivision Provisions and Update to Administrative Design Flexibility Regulations for Downtown.

Commissioners McCarthy and Petitpas will be excused.

August 17 Sign Code Amendment

Commissioner Petitpas will be excused.

Commissioner McCarthy should meet with Mr. Lee in the next week regarding the upcoming downtown regulations.

REPORTS

Ms. Peckol reported that there were no additional items referred to the Planning Commission by the Council at the July 19 Council meeting. The content of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan Amendment package is scheduled for approval on August 16. Council approved the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Plan. Innovative Housing is scheduled for approval on August 16.

APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

The proposed approval of the July 13, 2005 Meeting Summary was postponed to the next meeting.

ADJOURN

Chair Snodgrass adjourned the meeting at 9:02 p.m.

Minutes Approved On:

Recording Secretary: